



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,104	04/10/2006	Ulrich Simon	288335US0PCT	3716
22850 7590 11/13/2009 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER DOLLINGER, MICHAEL M				
ART UNIT 1796		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 11/13/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com

oblonpat@oblon.com

jgardner@oblon.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/575,104

**Applicant(s)**

SIMON ET AL.

**Examiner**

MIKE DOLLINGER

**Art Unit**

1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 22-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 22-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S5108)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09/18/2009
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no support in the specification for a negative limitation excluding a crosslinker from the upper dot. According to MPEP § 2173.05(i), any claim containing a negative limitation which does not have basis in the original disclosure should be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the written description requirement. *Ex Parte Grasselli*, 231 USPQ 393 (Bd. App. 1983), *aff'd mem.*, 738 F.2d 453 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Furthermore, the mere absence of a positive recitation is not the basis for an exclusion.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-9, 22-29 and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simon et al (US 6,300,413 B1) in view of Hefele (US 5,153,064).
3. Regarding claims 1, 2, 4 and 5, Simon et al. disclose a hot-melt adhesive composition for coating, lamination, or coating and lamination of a sheet-like structure in accordance with the double dot technique with an upper and lower dot (see Example). Simon et al. disclose the aforementioned structure wherein the upper and lower dots comprise either an amine-terminated copolyamide (column 1, line 10) or an OH-terminated copolyester (column 1, lines 21-22), and further comprising a crosslinker (column 2, line 42), and acrylic and polyurethane dispersions (column 1, line 56-57).
4. Regarding claim 3, Simon et al. disclose identical ranges for the physical properties (column 3, lines 25-30).
5. Regarding claims 6 and 7, Simon et al. disclose crosslinkers that are solid isocyanates with more than two free NCO groups and a melting range of 100-130°C (column 3, lines 3-5).
6. Regarding claim 8, Simon et al. disclose a crosslinker that is an epoxide with the exact same properties claimed (column 3, lines 5-10).
7. Regarding claims 9 and 26, Simon et al. disclose a trimerized diisocyanate which has been passivated and processed as an aqueous paste (column 2, lines 44-48). Simon et al. also disclose a solid isocyanates crosslinker with more than two free NCO groups (column 3, lines 3-4).
8. Regarding claim 22, Simon et al. disclose copolyester based on terephthalic acid, isophthalic acid and butanediol, or butanediol in combination with small amounts of

other diols (glycols) (column 3, lines 35-38). This disclosure anticipates the combinations of glycols claimed in claim 14. Examiner notes that PTHF is also known as polytetramethylene glycol and is considered a glycol in organic chemistry practice.

9. Regarding claim 23, Simon et al. disclose an interlining material for clothing comprising a material and a coating or lamination according to the double dot method of claim 1 in the examples in columns 3-5.

10. Regarding claims 24 and 25, Simon et al. disclose polyurethane and acrylate dispersions (column 1, lines 55-57). Examiner notes that acrylates are derivatives of acrylic acids and the species of "acrylate" anticipates the genus of "acrylic," as claimed.

11. Regarding claim 27, Simon et al. discloses a crosslinker that is a trimerized diisocyanate which has been passivated by extrusion with an atactic polyolefin (column 2, lines 44-47).

12. Regarding claim 28, 31 and 32, Simon et al disclose that crosslinking occurs in the lower dot during drying and the upper dot during melting (column 4 lines 38-42). Drying occurs at 130°C (column 3 lines 64-66) and joining temperature occurs at 127°C (column 4 lines 9-11). All the starting materials melt between 100°C and 120°C (column 4 lines 55-64). The cross-linking temperature is henceforth necessarily between 100°C and 130°C and the upper and lower dots are bonded in the melt.

13. Regarding claim 29, Simon et al. disclose a method of coating or laminating sheetlike structures according to the double dot method in claim 1 in the examples in columns 3-5.

14. Regarding claim 33, the hot melt adhesive of Simon et al. does not contain a polyethylene matrix. While the adhesive does contain an atactic polypropylene that may be copolymerized with an ethylene comonomer and a butene copolymer [column 3butane 12-22] but this does not read on a polyethylene matrix.
15. Regarding claim 34, the upper dot consists of a polyamide polymer with no crosslinker.
16. Simon et al. fail to disclose a multilayer adhesive structure which combines a lower dot comprising a copolyester with an upper dot comprising a copolyamide.
17. Hefele teaches multilayer adhesive structures in accordance with the double dot method analogous to those structures disclosed in Simon et al. with lower dots comprising copolyesters and upper dots comprising copolyamides (Examples 3 and 4). These structures show better adhesion values (see Table, column 9) than analogous structures in which both upper and lower dots are copolyesters. Hefele also discloses that copolyester hot-melt adhesives exhibit better washing stability than copolyamide hot-melt adhesives (column 2, lines 28-30).
18. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have prepared a double dot hotmelt adhesive with an amine terminated copolyamide upper dot and OH-terminated polyester lower dot because Simon et al teach that it is within the skill of the art to prepare a double dot hotmelt adhesive with an amine terminated copolyamide or an OH-terminated polyester and Hefele teaches that it is within the skill of the art to prepare a double dot adhesive from a copolyamide upper dot and a polyester lower. One would have been motivated to

combine a copolyamides upper dot and polyester lower dot because Hefele teaches that these structures show better adhesion values and exhibit better washing stability. Absent any evidence to the contrary, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success in combining a copolyamides upper dot and a polyester lower dot to form a double dot hotmelt adhesive.

19. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simon et al. (US 6,300,413 B1) in view of Hefele (US 5,153,064) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kohlhammer et al (US 5,977,244).

20. Simon et al in view of Hefele fail to teach the epichlorohydrin as a crosslinker. Simon et al do teach, however, that bisphenol A is a suitable crosslinker (column 3 lines 10-11).

21. Kohlhammer et al. disclose typical epoxide crosslinkers for textiles of acrylic copolymers (column 2 lines 13-16) are epichlorohydrin and bisphenol A (column 3, lines 47-50). Kohlhammer et al. henceforth teach that epichlorohydrin and bisphenol A are functional equivalents for the purpose of crosslinking acrylic polymers. When the prior art recognizes two compounds as functional equivalent for the same purpose, it is *prima facie* obvious to substitute one compound for the other. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used epichlorohydrin as a crosslinker in the hotmelt adhesive structure of Simon et al.

22. Additionally, selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use is *prima facie* obvious, see *Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp.*, 325 U.S.

327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have crosslinked a lower dot of a double dot interlining with epichlorohydrin because Simon et al. teach that is within the skill of the art to crosslink the lower dot of a double dot structure and Kohlhammer et al. teach that textiles of acrylic copolymers may be crosslinked with epichlorohydrin.

23. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simon et al (US 6,300,413 B1) in view of Hefele (US 5,153,064) with further evidence provided by Mattor et al (US 4,282,054).

24. Applicants claim the use of the lower dot of the multilayer adhesive structure as a strikethrough barrier. This is an intended use limitation. The recitation of an intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

25. Simon et al in view of Hefele do not explicitly disclose that the lower dot is used as a strikethrough barrier. Simon et al do teach, however, that the lower dot is crosslinkable (abstract).

26. Mattor et al teach that crosslinkable resins can be used as a strikethrough barrier on a sheet-like structure (column 1, liners 53-58). Since the lower dot of Simon et al is crosslinkable, it may be used as a strikethrough barrier.



27. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simon et al (US 6,300,413 B1) in view of Hefele (US 5,153,064) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Hiratsuka et al (US 5,019,347). Simon et al. disclose application of a lower dot as a paste comprising a passivated isocyanate (column 2, lines 44-48) but fail to disclose application of the lower dot in halftone formation.

28. Hiratsuka et al teach application of an multilayer adhesive coating applied to a sheetlike structure in a formation of dots distributed microscopically at random and of varying size and shape but appear essentially uniformly in total (column 4, lines 18-21). Examiner takes the position that any non uniform distribution of dots that appears essentially uniform in total reads on the halftone method. Hiratsuka et al. teach that the adhesive area ratio can be adjusted (column 4, lines 28-34) and henceforth optimized to the thickness of the substrate by adjusting the size and width of the dots (column 4, lines 38-41).

29. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the halftone method with the multilayer adhesive structure of claim 1 because Simon et al in view of Hefele teach that it is within the skill of the art to form a double dot adhesive wherein the lower dot is applied as a paste and Hiratsuka et al teach it is within the skill of the art to apply an adhesive in the double dot method. One would have applied the lower dot in a halftone method in order to have controlled the amount of adhesive applied and receive the expected benefit of low waste application with variable adhesion and texture of the final interlining. Absent any evidence to the contrary, there would have been reasonable expectation of success of

optimizing the adhesive area ratio to the thickness of the sheet-like structure to which the adhesive is applied.

30. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simon et al. (US 6,300,413 B1) in view of Hefele (US 5,153,064) as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of Kohlhammer et al (US 5,977,244), and still in further view of Dobson et al (US 5,242,877).

31. Applicant claims the multilayer adhesive structure wherein the crosslinking reaction is accelerated by catalysis. Simon et al in vie of Hefele, discussed above, do not teach the acceleration of crosslinking with accelerating catalysts.

32. Kohlhammer et al. disclose crosslinking catalysts for the textile binder composition (column 3, lines 58-60).

33. Dobson et al. teach that catalysts speed up (accelerate) a reaction by lowering the activation energy (column 1 lines 27-29). Accelerating a reaction reduces reaction time and lowering the activation energy reduces energy input, both of which reduce production costs.

34. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have accelerated the crosslinking in a lower dot of a double dot interlining because Simon et al in view of Hefele teach that it is within the skill of the art to crosslink the lower dot of a double dot interlining and Kohlhammer et al. teach that it is within the skill of the art to use crosslinking catalysts for textile binders. One would have been motivated to do this because Dobson et al. teach that accelerating chemical

reactions reduces the reaction time and energy input henceforth reduces cost. Absent any evidence to the contrary, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success in accelerating the crosslinking reaction of Simon et al in view of Hefele with crosslinking catalysts.

### ***Response to Arguments***

35. Applicant's arguments filed 09/18/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

36. Applicants argue that Simon et al differs from the present invention in several respects one of which is that there is no requirement to stabilize an isocyanate crosslinking reactant in a polyolefin matrix. Simon et al, on the other hand, incorporate the polyisocyanate into a polyolefin matrix. This argument is not convincing because the claims do not exclude a polyolefin from the present invention. While claim 33 excludes a polyethylene matrix, the polyolefin matrix disclosed in Simon et al is an atactic polypropylene.

37. Applicants also argue that an improvement of the present invention is inter-dot bonding between the upper and lower dots. This argument is not convincing because the double dot adhesive of Simon et al also has the advantage of inter dot bonding between the upper and lower dots [column 4 lines 38-42].

38. Applicants also argue that in the present invention the crosslinker is only present in the base dot and not the upper dot. This argument is not convincing because in the

adhesive of Simon et al the crosslinker is only present in the base dot and not the upper dot.

39. Applicants argue that Hefele does not read on the claimed invention because it includes a double dot comprising a mixture of polyester and polyethylene matrix. This argument is not convincing. Hefele is not included in the rejection of record in order to incorporate the actual polyester matrix. Rather the polyester matrix is taught as an alternative in Simon et al while Hefele merely teaches that it is advantageous to combine a polyester base dot with a polyamide upper dot. The composition of Hefele is not incorporated into the adhesive of Simon et al. The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

#### **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MIKE DOLLINGER whose telephone number is (571)270-5464. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on 571-272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/mmd/

/Randy Gulakowski/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796